

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

COURTNEY MOTLEY,

Plaintiff,

vs.

STATE OF NEVADA, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No.: 2:21-cv-02075-GMN-BNW

**ORDER ADOPTING
REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

Pending before the Court is the Report and Recommendation (“R&R”), (ECF No. 88), from United States Magistrate Brenda N. Weksler recommending that Plaintiff Courtney Motley’s Amended Relief Request and Motion for Extra Garnishments, which Magistrate Judge Weksler interprets as a Motion to Amend, be denied for failure to follow the applicable local rules and Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. (*See generally* R&R, ECF No. 88).

A party may file specific written objections to the findings and recommendations of a United States Magistrate Judge made pursuant to Local Rule IB 1-4. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B); D. Nev. R. IB 3-2. Upon the filing of such objections, the Court must make a *de novo* determination of those portions to which objections are made if the Magistrate Judge’s findings and recommendations concern matters that may not be finally determined by a magistrate judge. D. Nev. R. IB 3-2(b). The Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the Magistrate Judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); D. Nev. R. IB 3-2(b). Where a party fails to object, however, the Court is not required to conduct “any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection.” *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985) (citing 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)). Indeed, the Ninth Circuit has recognized that a district court is not required to review a magistrate judge’s R&R where no objections have been filed. *See, e.g., United States v. Reyna–Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1122 (9th Cir. 2003).


1 No objections to the R&R were filed, and the deadline to do so has passed. (*See*
2 *generally* R&R) (setting a May 9, 2025, deadline for objections).

3 Accordingly,

4 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Report and Recommendation, (ECF No. 88), is
5 **ACCEPTED and ADOPTED** in full.

6 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Amended Relief Request and Motion for
7 Extra Garnishments, (ECF No. 83), is **DENIED**.

8 Dated this 30 day of May, 2025.

9
10 
11 _____
12 Gloria M. Navarro, District Judge
13 United States District Court
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25